

REMARKS

Summary Of Office Action

Claims 1-39 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-6, 14-19 and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Emens et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,591,279 ("Emens").

Claims 7-13, 20-26 and 33-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emens in view of Vaithilingam et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,411,724 ("Vaithilingam").

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' Reply

Applicants have proposed amending claims 1, 14, and 27 to more particularly define the invention.

No new matter would be added by the proposed amendments and all of the amendments are fully justified by the original specification.

Reconsideration of this application in view of the proposed amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants' claimed invention, as defined by amended independent claims 1, 14 and 27, is directed to a method and systems for providing remote access to captured content. Using a capture device, content regarding an event (e.g., detected by a sensor) is captured and transmitted to a remote computer, where the content is associated with a user account and is published to remote server that contains a database. The database stores locally captured content associated with the

user account and is updated with the published content. A user may access the published content using a user access device.

The Emens system refers to a computer-based notification system. A user may define an event notification profile such that, when a sensor receives an indication that corresponds to those of the notification profile, a notification, including a digital image of the event, is sent to the user in an email.

The Examiner contends that Emens discloses applicants' invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 14 and 27. In particular, the Examiner contends that Emens teaches "automatically publishing the content on a remote server (col. 2, ll. 47-58, the content would be made available to the user via the internet)" (Office Action, §§ 4, 10 and 16).

Applicants' respectfully submit that Emus does not show all of the elements of applicants' amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27. In particular, Emus fails to show or suggest having a database including locally captured content associated with the user account, on the remote server and publishing content to the remote server by updating the database with the content. In contrast, Emens refers to sending the content for an event captured by a sensor directly to a user via email. The content for the event is sent in isolation and is not used to update a database containing locally captured events. Accordingly, Emens does not show all of the elements of applicants' amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27.

Independent claims 1, 14 and 27 are therefore in condition for allowance. Claims 2-6, 15-19 and 28-32, which

depend from respective independent claims 1, 14 and 27, are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 7-13, 20-26 and 33-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emens in view of Vaithilingam. Applicants respectfully submit that because these claims depend from claims 1, 14, and 27, they are allowable for at least those reasons discussed above.

In view of the forgoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Chasan
Registration No. 54,026
Agent for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
Tel.: (212) 596-9000
Fax: (212) 596-9090